

A gamma ray burst model with small baryon contamination

Mario Vietri¹ and Luigi Stella²

¹Università di Roma 3, Via della Vasca Navale 84, 00147 Roma,
Italy, E-mail: vietri@corelli.fis.uniroma3.it

² Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, 00040 Monte Porzio Catone (Roma)
Italy, E-mail: stella@heads.mporzio.astro.it
Affiliated to I.C.R.A.

ABSTRACT

We present a scenario (SupraNova) for the formation of GRBs occurring when a supramassive neutron star (SMNS) loses so much angular momentum that centrifugal support against self-gravity becomes impossible, and the star implodes to a black hole. This may be the baryon-cleanest environment proposed so far, because the SN explosion in which the SMNS formed swept the medium surrounding the remnant, and the quickly spinning remnant loses energy through magnetic dipole radiation at a rate exceeding its Eddington luminosity by some four orders of magnitude. The implosion is adiabatic because neutrinos have short mean free paths, and silent, given the prompt collapse of the polar caps. However, a mass $M_l \approx 0.1 M_\odot$ in the equatorial belt can easily reach centrifugal equilibrium. The mechanism of energy extraction is via the conversion of the Poynting flux (due to the large-scale magnetic field locked into the minitorus) into a magnetized relativistic wind. Occasionally this model will produce quickly decaying, or non-detectable afterglows.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts – stars: neutron – black holes – relativity: general – instabilities

1. Introduction

A successful model for the progenitors of gamma ray bursts (GRBs) must make contact with the fireball model (Rees and Mészáros 1992), which so successfully predicted the discovery of afterglows in the radio (Paczynski and Rhoads 1993), in the optical (Mészáros and Rees 1997a, Katz 1994), in the X-ray band (Vietri 1997), and explained radio flares (Goodman 1997). While some features of afterglows remain at present unexplained, yet

there can be little doubt that the overall energetics, time-scales, power-law behaviour, and appearance of longer wavelength radiation at later times are all nicely accounted for.

The crucial point of the fireball model is that it channels the large explosion energy ($> 10^{53}$ erg, barring beaming) in a locale with small baryon contamination ($\approx 10^{-4} M_{\odot}$, Rees and Mészáros 1992). From this point of view, hypernova explosions (Woosley 1993, Paczyński 1998) are problematic: massive stars are well known to have powerful winds which may carry away upward of $10 M_{\odot}$, thusly baryon-contaminating the environment in which the GRB is eventually to go off. Obviously, a very thin beam may be a way out of this conundrum, but this begins to look unlikely, given the currently available observational evidence (Grindlay 1998). Also scenarios involving accretion-induced collapse of white dwarfs (Usov 1992, Blackman, Yi, Field 1996, Yi and Blackman 1997) are troublesome, both because of the large amounts of baryons lying about, and because of the long timescales required to accrete sizeable amounts of mass.

Given the considerable specific angular momenta involved, a plausibly baryon-clean model is the merger of neutron star/neutron star, or neutron star/black holes binaries (Narayan, Paczyński and Piran 1992) which is expected to take place outside the environment where the binary formed (Bloom, Sigurdsson and Pols 1998). However, at least some bursts (though not all, Wijers and Galama 1998) seem to arise within dense environments suggesting star forming regions: such is the case of GRB 970111 (Ferozi *et al.*, 1998), GRB 970828 (Murakami *et al.*, 1997, Groot *et al.*, 1998a) and GRB 980326 (Groot *et al.*, 1998b). Since it is possible that GRBs arise from several distinct sources (Mészáros, Rees and Wijers 1998b), we propose here a different model, where the initial explosion is triggered by the gravitational implosion to a black hole of a supramassive neutron star: we call this model a SupraNova.

In the following, we shall first discuss some properties of equilibrium supramassive neutron stars, then the implosion to a black hole and the extraction of the energy that leads to the GRB. Reasons why this model remains baryon-clean will be discussed in Section 3, and in the last section we will discuss some observational consequences.

2. On supramassive neutron stars and their implosion

All known equations of state for matter at nuclear densities allow the construction of equilibrium models of supramassive neutron stars (SMNSs), *i.e.* rotating sequences with constant baryon number but different angular momenta; no member of this sequence may be non-rotating because they have masses at infinity larger than the largest mass for static

models (for recent work on the topic see Cook, Shapiro and Teukolsky 1994, and Salgado, Bonazzola, Gourgoulhon and Haensel 1994). Equilibrium sequences for models with baryon number exceeding a critical $\mathcal{B}_c$ above which no static equilibria are possible, start out exactly at break-up angular speed; depending upon the equation of state, these models have masses in the range $M \approx 2 - 3.5 M_\odot$, equatorial radii $R_{eq} \approx 11 - 18 \text{ km}$, and angular velocities $\omega \approx 8,000 - 12,000 \text{ s}^{-1}$. Though fast rotating, the total angular momentum of these models is not large: measured in units of the critical angular momentum $J_c = GM^2/c$ of a black hole of the same mass at infinity, they have $j \approx 0.6 - 0.78$. An important feature of these models is that, as they lose angular momentum, through most of the models' parameter space they speed up: they contract so as to reduce their moment of inertia, and increase their angular velocity. For this reason, angular momentum loss through, for instance, magnetic dipole radiation actually speeds up. As the losses mount, the models reach a point, having about half of the initial angular momentum, where they become secularly unstable to axisymmetric perturbations. The evolution of these models beyond this point has not been investigated yet, but the eventual fate of the star is sealed, since it cannot connect to a static, stable configuration: it will implode to a black hole.

The above results hold for every equation of state, so that we regard them as rather robust. Currently, there seems to be no obvious theoretical reason why these stars should not form in the collapse of massive stars. A recent claim (Andersson 1998) that a new type of r-modes leads to such a copious emission of gravitational waves, to make any fast-spinning neutron star slow down within a year, would seem to imply that SMNSs, which speed up as they lose angular momentum, should collapse to a black hole faster than expected on the basis of pure magnetic dipole radiation (Eq. 1, to be derived shortly). However, these computations only concern idealized neutron star models, and neglect proper, general relativistic treatment of viscosity, convection, and non-linear effects, all of which may slow down, or even damp this instability; they will be neglected henceforth.

An approximate estimate of the time it takes for this configuration to collapse is given by assuming that the major source of angular momentum loss is through the usual magnetic dipole radiation; the star's rotational energy is $E_{rot} = J\omega/2$, and, since ω is roughly constant as the star loses angular momentum passing through different stages of equilibrium (Salgado *et al.*, 1994, Cook *et al.*, 1994), $\dot{E}_{rot} \approx \omega \dot{J}/2$; equating this to the classical Pacini (1967) formula, one gets $\dot{J}$, and the spin-down time to halve J , as required by the onset of the instability

$$t_{sd} \equiv \frac{J}{\dot{J}} = 10 \text{ yr} \frac{j}{0.6} \left(\frac{M}{3 M_\odot} \right)^2 \left(\frac{15 \text{ km}}{R_{eq}} \right)^6 \left(\frac{10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}}{\omega} \right)^4 \left(\frac{10^{12} \text{ G}}{B} \right)^2. \quad (1)$$

Since this is much longer than the viscous timescale inside the NS, on which the

configuration evolves after it has become secularly unstable toward the final collapse, t_{sd} is a good estimate of the timescale between the first explosion (a normal SN where a SMNS is formed) and the implosion to a black hole.

As the star loses angular momentum, the centrifugal force weakens until support against self-gravity becomes impossible: the star implodes. The implosion is likely to be strongly non-homologous, the central densest regions forming a black hole first, with the outermost regions collapsing later. To a first approximation, the implosion will be ‘silent’, with most matter being swallowed down the hole promptly, since the total angular momentum of the collapsing NS is subcritical ($j \approx 0.6 - 0.78$). In particular, it is likely that all mass lying close to the spin axis ends up in the hole, a point already made by Mészáros and Rees (1997b) and Paczyński (1998). Furthermore, the neutrinos’ mean free path inside the NS is expected to be small, so the collapse will be, most likely, adiabatic. Further baryon contamination must be small: for instance, it is difficult to think of any outwardly propagating shock capable of ejecting baryons, because of the lack of a hard surface and of energetic phenomena capable of releasing considerable counterpressures. Also, for reasonable magnetic fields ($B < 10^{15} \text{ G}$), any magnetic-related phenomena using all the energy in the magnetic field could push at most $\approx 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$ in centrifugal equilibrium, all most likely in the equatorial plane.

It is likely that this implosion is accompanied by the release of a copious amount of energy in gravitational waves; in fact, the known, axisymmetric instability of the equilibrium sequence is just secular (Friedman, Ipser and Sorkin 1988); it is possible that this leads to a nearby, distinct equilibrium model which becomes dynamically unstable as it loses angular momentum; the most likely source of instability is to a bar-formation mode ($m = 2$) which leads to release of gravitational waves (Chandrasekhar 1970).

Not all mass will be immediately accreted, though: the outermost layers, in fact, have centrifugal accelerations only $\approx 10\%$ below the local gravitational attraction (Salgado *et al.*, 1994). Thus, even if the pressure gradient were suddenly removed, these layers would just contract a bit (barring large energy losses due to shocks caused by the converging flow), and halt in centrifugal equilibrium at a radius $\approx 10\%$ smaller than the initial one. We cannot compute M_l at this stage, so we give only a suggestive argument showing that, possibly, $M_l \approx 0.1 M_{\odot}$. Stellar dynamical simulations of self-gravitating galaxies in purely rotational equilibrium show that these objects are unstable to bar-forming $m = 2$ modes, a well-known result (Hohl 1971, Ostriker and Peebles 1973, Binney and Tremaine 1987). One may see these as energy conserving instabilities, where stars may acquire some energy because the gravitational potential in which they move is not constant in time. In such systems, typically $\approx 1\%$ of the mass (originally, all stars on high angular momentum orbits)

reaches orbits outside the main body of the resulting bar, becoming detached (but not unbound) from the galaxy. We may expect the total fraction of mass lost in hydrodynamic systems to be comparable to this, since here too parcels of fluid on high angular momentum orbits interact with the rest of the system mostly through the gravitational potential: in fact, according to the models of Salgado *et al.* (1994), the contribution of the pressure gradient to the support of the outer layers of the star is much smaller than the centrifugal one. Moreover neutron stars differ from stellar dynamical systems because of losses by gravitational waves, and possibly neutrinos, which weaken gravitational binding of the outermost layers: it is sufficient that $\approx 10\%$ of the whole star mass at infinity ends up as GWs, for the equatorial belt to become rotationally-supported: this corresponds to $0.3 M_\odot$ radiated away, well within current estimates of GW emission efficiencies in non-axisymmetric collapses to black hole (Smarr 1979). Neutrinos not trapped inside the collapsing SMNS will also carry away binding mass, or may provide pressure pushing the equatorial belt into centrifugal equilibrium. We thus expect that the SMNS may typically shed a few percent of its total mass to centrifugal equilibrium. This implies $M_l \gtrsim 0.1 M_\odot$.

The ensuing configuration is that of a largish black hole ($M \approx 2 - 3 M_\odot$), spinning at subcritical speed ($j \approx 0.6$), surrounded by a thin equatorial belt of matter of mass M_l which could not be immediately accreted because its angular momentum, supplemented by the factors discussed above, makes it rest in centrifugal equilibrium. The binding energy of the left-over mass M_l is

$$E_b = 3 \times 10^{52} \text{ erg} \frac{M_{SMNS}}{2 M_\odot} \frac{M_l}{0.1 M_\odot} \frac{20 \text{ km}}{R_{eq}}. \quad (2)$$

This binding energy must be radiated as the leftover accretes onto the black hole, and it is this energy release which powers the GRB proper, not the gravitational collapse *per se*. Even the most powerful bursts (Kulkarni *et al.*, 1998) only require $M_l \approx 0.1\theta^2 M_\odot$, where $\theta^2/4$ is the beaming fraction.

The leftover material will be threaded by the same, large-scale magnetic field lines that threaded it inside the NS; the field will be amplified by shearing induced by differential rotation inside the accreting torus. Assuming that the angular speed difference between the front and back edges nearly equals ω , a field of initial strength $B \approx 10^{12} \text{ G}$ will be amplified to 10^{15} G (*i.e.*, well below equipartition with differential rotation, an upper limit which it is not necessary to attain) in ≈ 10 differential rotations; the amplification timescale is $t_a \approx 0.01 \text{ s}$, comparable to the bursts' rise-times. At this point the torus will radiate at the rate $\dot{E} \approx -B^2 \omega^4 r^6 / 6c^3 = 10^{50} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, enough to power a burst. The details of the conversion of Poynting flux into a magnetized relativistic wind have been discussed in both different and similar contexts by Usov (1992, 1994), Mészáros and Rees (1997b), Katz

(1997). Alternatively, one may invoke the Blandford–Znajek (1977) mechanism to extract the much larger hole’s rotational energy (Mészáros, Rees and Wijers 1998b).

The energy release rate computed above of course exceeds the Eddington luminosity of the minitorus by more than 10 orders of magnitude. The energy deposition occurs outside the minitorus, but it is of course quite likely that some mass is blown off the torus, for instance by photons that hit it and heat it. This baryon outflow will certainly contaminate the zones of the relativistic wind that are most distant from the spin axis, because we do not expect any efficient angular momentum exchange in the process. Still, this implies that the outflow may be non-isotropic, and moderately beamed. The situation that we envision is similar to that described by Mészáros and Rees (1997b), with a smoothly tapering beam.

3. A clean environment

The volume immediately surrounding the SMNS will be vacated of baryons by two effects. First, the SN explosion accompanying the SMNS’s formation will sweep away ISM baryons. We can gauge the importance of this effect by considering the fact that most of the mass around the Crab pulsar, the only plerionic remnant for which relevant data are available, is well-known to be located in the filaments, which amount to no more than $\sim 5M_{\odot}$ (Fesen, Shull and Hurford 1997), within about 3 arcminutes. At a canonical distance of 2 *kpc*, this corresponds to a present average baryon number density $n \approx 10 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Assuming uniform expansion in the period from t_{sd} to the Crab’s current age, implies that, at t_{sd} , the average baryon density was $n \approx 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Within a distance $D = 10^{15} \text{ cm}$, more than enough to guarantee millisecond variability (which requires $D \approx 10^{12} \text{ cm}$, Rees and Mészáros 1994) this corresponds to a total baryon mass $M \approx 3 \times 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$, below $10^{-4} M_{\odot}$, the upper limit to get a significantly relativistic expansion. We regard the above estimate as an upper limit because the Crab is well-known to have an unusually low expansion velocity (a full factor of 3 below other Type II SNRs, Fesen, Shull and Hurford 1997) and because it considers the mass in the filaments as if it were uniformly distributed over the whole volume rather than concentrated in the observed thin shell.

The second effect is due to the large energy release by the magnetic dipole rotation after the explosion,

$$\dot{E} = -\frac{B^2 R^6 \omega^4 \sin^2 \alpha}{6c^3} = -3 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \left(\frac{B}{10^{12} \text{ G}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{R}{15 \text{ km}} \right)^6 \left(\frac{\omega}{10^4 \text{ s}^{-1}} \right)^4 \sin^2 \alpha ; \quad (3)$$

since a large fraction of this energy will be converted to photons, the ensuing luminosity in fact exceeds the Eddington luminosity for the $\approx 3M_{\odot}$ NS by about 4 orders of magnitude. This is of course identical to the well-known plerion model for SN remnants (Ostriker

and Gunn 1971, Reynolds and Chevalier 1984), except that the total energy released ($\approx 10^{53}$ erg) is much larger; for this reason we cannot directly apply these models to our case, except to notice that its effect will surely be of lowering the naive baryon mass estimate obtained above ($\approx 3 \times 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$).

4. Observational implications

We now discuss observational signatures of the occurrence of this model. It shares with all models for which GRBs are generated when young, massive stars die a possibly exotic death, all predictions that associate GRBs with star forming regions. In particular, GRBs’ afterglows should be localized within star forming galaxies, and their redshift distributions ought to match closely the history of star formation in the Universe (Madau *et al.*, 1996, Lilly *et al.*, 1996). Furthermore, the optical afterglow may be at times absorbed by dust present in the star-forming regions, and the X-ray one may show absorption by large equivalent column depths by neutral elements. In fact, in the t_{sd} years elapsed since the first explosion, the SN shock front will have reached a distance $R_s = 10^{18}$ cm ($v_{exp}/3 \times 10^9$ cm s $^{-1}$)($t_{sd}/10$ yr). The total column depth of baryons, at distance R_s , is $N_b = 10^{21}$ cm $^{-2}$ ($M_{ej}/10 M_{\odot}$)($R_s/10^{18}$ cm) $^{-2}$ with M_{ej} the ejecta mass; this column depth may perhaps be observable (Murakami *et al.*, 1997). Thus we may sometimes expect to see the ionization edges discussed by Mészáros and Rees (1998a,b) due to dense, stationary outlying material.

We argued above that in its maxi-Crab phase the SMNS will vacate of baryons a sizeable cavity around itself. Outside this cavity, however, there will be an outwardly increasing density gradient, a well-known property of Sedov solutions. In fact, matter behind the SN shock is subsonic with respect to the outwardly propagating shock, so that it must be in approximate pressure equilibrium with previously shocked material. However, since the shock is decelerating, just-shocked material will be at lower temperature than material shocked long before and, in pressure equilibrium, this implies higher densities. The exact Sedov solutions yield for the innermost regions $n_{ISM} \propto r^d$ where $d = 3/(\gamma - 1) = 9/2$ (Landau and Lifshitz 1979). If the time between the SN explosion and the burst is rather short, it may happen that the collision between different shells, which gives rise to the burst proper (Paczynski and Xu 1994), takes place in a region which the maxi-Crab effect has not managed to empty of baryons, yet. In this case, the afterglow will propagate into the Sedov solution, *i.e.*, inside an outwardly increasing density gradient. In the afterglow, the time t_{nr} of the transition to the non-relativistic expansion regime is reasonably sensitive to the density gradient; Mészáros, Rees and Wijers (1998a) find $t_{nr} \approx t_{\gamma} \Gamma^q$, where t_{γ} is the

duration the burst in the γ -ray band, $\Gamma \approx 100$ is the initial Lorentz factor of the ejecta, and $q = (8 + 2d)/(3 + d)$, for adiabatic expansion (notice that we defined as $-d$ what they call $+d$). For expansion in a wind, $d = -2$, and thus $q = 4$, while for expansion into an adiabatic Sedov solution, $d = 9/2$, $q = 2.2$, so that the transition to the non-relativistic regime is anticipated by up to four orders of magnitude in time. For $t_\gamma = 1$ s, $q = 2.2$, $t_{nr} \approx 7$ hours. After t_{nr} , the luminosity steepens considerably, to $t^{-2.4}$ or steeper (Wijers, Mészáros and Rees 1997). This provides thus a natural explanation for those cases where either no afterglow is seen (in the hard X-ray GRB 970111, Feroci *et al.*, 1998; in the optical GRB 970828, Groot *et al.*, 1998a), or it is seen to decrease more steeply than the other afterglows (GRB 980326, Groot *et al.*, 1998b).

The formation rate of SMNSs in an $L_\star$ -galaxy, $1/t_{SMNS}$, is of course expected to be of order of, but less than, the rate of formation for pulsars, in our Galaxy currently about $1/t_p$, with $t_p \approx 100$ yr. If the formation rate is around a factor of 100 lower than this, as suggested by rough considerations on the range of mass and angular momentum over which SMNSs form, there is ample room to account for all observed GRBs, including a moderate degree of beaming. It may prove interesting to search for such objects. The fraction of the time between each birth through which they are active in the maxi-Crab phase is t_{sd}/t_{SMNS} , so that there will be one $L_\star$ galaxy every t_{SMNS}/t_{sd} containing an active one. Given the luminosity density of the Universe ($j_o = 1.7 \times 10^8 L_\odot \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ in the V-band) and the typical luminosity of an $L_\star$ -galaxy like our own, ($L_\star = 10^{10} L_\odot$ in the V-band, Binney and Tremaine 1987) we find that the closest such active maxi-Crab should lie at a distance $R = (3L_\star t_{SMNS}/4\pi j_o t_{sd})^{1/3} = 52 \text{ Mpc}$ where we used Eq. 1 and $t_{SMNS} = 10^5 \text{ yr}$ which is necessary if SMNSs must account for GRBs. At this distance, the flux of Eq. 3 corresponds to $\approx 10^{-10} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, pulsed with frequency $\nu = \omega/2\pi \approx 1000 - 2000 \text{ Hz}$. If the Crab pulsar is anything to go by, we expect an X-ray flux of $\approx 10^{-11} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (only a fraction of which will be pulsed) from a pointlike source well offset from the center of the galaxy. A detection of the pulsations from such a source is beyond the capabilities of Rossi XTE, but well within reach of very large area X-ray telescopes such as XMM and, especially, Constellation.

In summary, we presented a SupraNova model for gamma-ray bursts, *i.e.*, a model with a two-step collapse to a black hole not induced by accretion. The advantages of this model lie in its ability to keep the environment baryon-free, both because of the SN explosion that goes with the first collapse, which cleans up the surroundings, and because of the clean, silent, collapse of the NS once centrifugal support weakens critically. Second, we discussed a rotating magnetic dipole radiating much energy through its large rotation rate, which injects into the NS's surroundings a luminosity exceeding Eddington's by four orders of magnitude, and which speeds up as a consequence of energy losses. This too contributes

to keeping the NS’s environment baryon–clean. A rough estimate suggests that the total environment pollution by baryons may be in the range of $\approx 10^{-4} M_{\odot}$.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, N., 1998, ApJ, 502, 708.
- Binney, J., Tremaine, S., 1987, *Galactic Dynamics*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Blackman, E.G., Yi, I., Field, G.B., 1996, ApJ, 473, L79.
- Blandford, R.D., Znajek, R.L., 1977, MNRAS, 179, 433.
- Bloom, J. Sigurdsson, S., Pols, O., 1998, MNRAS, in press (astro-ph. n. 9805222).
- Chandrasekhar, S., 1970, Phys. Rev. Lett., 24, 611.
- Cook, G.B., Shapiro, S.L., Teukolsky, S.A., 1994, ApJ, 424, 823.
- Feroci, M., *et al.*, 1998, A&A, 332, L29.
- Fesen, R.A., Shull, J.M., Hurford, A.H., 1997, AJ, 113, 354.
- Friedman, J.L., Ipser, J.R., Sorkin, R.D., 1988, ApJ, 325, 722.
- Goodman, J.J., 1997, New Astron., 2, 449.
- Grindlay, J.E., 1998, ApJ, in press (astro-ph. n. 9808242).
- Groot, P.J., *et al.*, 1998a, ApJ, 493, L27.
- Groot, P.J., *et al.*, 1998b, ApJ, 502, L123.
- Hohl, F., 1971, ApJ, 168, 343.
- Katz, J.I., 1994, ApJ, 432, L107.
- Katz, J.I., 1997, ApJ, 490, 633.
- Kulkarni, S.R., *et al.*, 1998, Nature, 393, 35.
- Landau, L.D., Lifshitz, E.M., 1979, Fluid Dynamics, Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lilly, S.J., *et al.*, 1996, ApJ, 460, L1.
- Madau, P., *et al.*, 1996, MNRAS, 283, 1388.
- Mészáros, P., Rees, M.J., 1997a, ApJ, 476, 232.
- Mészáros, P., Rees, M.J., 1997b, ApJ, 482, L29.
- Mészáros, P., Rees, M.J., 1998a, ApJ, to appear, astro-ph. n. 9804119.
- Mészáros, P.J., Rees, M.J., 1998b, MNRAS, to appear, astro-ph. n. 9806183.

- Mészáros, P.J., Rees, M.J., Wijers, R.A.M.J., 1998a, *ApJ*, 499, 301.
- Mészáros, P.J., Rees, M.J., Wijers, R.A.M.J., 1998b, *New Astronomy*, in press (astro-ph. 9808106).
- Murakami, T., *et al.*, 1997, in *Gamma Ray Bursts*, Meegan, C., Preece, R. and Koshut, T. eds, 1997 (AIP: New York), p.435.
- Narayan, R., Paczyński, B., Piran, T., 1992, *ApJ*, 395, L83.
- Ostriker, J.P., Gunn, J.E., 1971, *ApJ*, 164, L95.
- Ostriker, J.P., Peebles, J.P.E., 1973, *ApJ*, 186, 467.
- Pacini, F., 1967, *Nature*, 216, 567.
- Paczyński, B., 1998, *ApJ*, 482, L29.
- Paczyński, B., Rhoads, J.E., 1993, *ApJ*, 395, L83.
- Paczyński, B., Xu, G., 1994, *ApJ*, 424, 708.
- Rees, M.J., Mészáros, P., 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 41P.
- Rees, M.J., Mészáros, P., 1994, *ApJ*, 430, L93.
- Reynolds, S.P. Chevalier, R.A., 1984, *ApJ*, 278, 630.
- Salgado, M., Bonazzola, S., Gourgoulhon, E., Haensel, P., 1994, *A&A*, 291, 155.
- Smarr, L.L., 1979, *Sources of Gravitational Radiation*, Cambridge (England): Cambridge University Press.
- Usov, V.V., 1992, *Nature*, 357, 472.
- Usov, V.V., 1994, *MNRAS*, 267, 1035.
- Vietri, M., 1997, *ApJ*, 478, L9.
- Yi, I., Blackman, E.G., 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 383.
- Wijers, R. A.M.J., Galama, T., 1998, *ApJ*, in press (astro-ph 9805341).
- Wijers, R. A.M.J., Rees, M.J., Mészáros, P., 1997, *MNRAS*, 288, 51P.
- Woosley, S.E., 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 273.